

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-7, 15, 19-21, and 43-46 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 15, and 43 are hereby amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims and consideration of the following remarks.

Request to Show Support

On page 2, paragraph 2 of the recent Final Office Action, the Examiner requests that the Applicant provide a specific reference in the Specification to support the claims. In particular, the Examiner has requested the Applicant to show support for the limitation of the action for the second user being the same as the action for the first user, and the first alias selection not being the same as the second alias selection. The Applicant believes that these limitations are inherently supported by the Specification in that pages 20-23 describe a *customized network shell that appears as a list of alias selections that are associated with actions*. It follows that if one user can customize a network shell based on his user access profile, then another user can also customize his network shell based upon his own user access profile. Thus, while the Specification describes the user experience for a single user, the user experience for a second user would inherently be the same. If one user can create an alias for a certain action, then another user can also create an alias for the same action. The aliases created by each user could therefore be different being that different users would customize their aliases based on their own individual preferences.

Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Amended independent claim 1 now requires processing the first alias selection to execute the action in a one of the plurality of service networks. Thus, the access server provides the user with access to a plurality of service networks. The access network determines in which service network the action should be executed. From the vantage point of the user, all that the user knows or is required to know is the alias for an action. The access server then advantageously determines the appropriate service network for the action. The user is shielded from having to interface with multiple service networks. Please see FIG. 5, access network 520 and service networks 530 and 540 for support.

In contrast, Hayes does not disclose an access server coupled to a plurality of service networks. Rather, Hayes discloses a standard client-server architecture whereby multiple clients interface directly with a single network. While network 100 (Hayes, FIG. 1) could be a service network, and server 202 (Hayes, FIG. 2) could provide services to client devices, Hayes does not disclose an access server in an access network that provides access to the service network. Instead, client devices access network 100 and server 202 directly.

Amended independent claim also 1 requires an access server receiving a first alias selection from a first user and a second alias selection from a second user. The first and second alias selections are different. The access server processes the first alias selection to determine an action associated with the first alias and then executes the action. The access server also processes the second alias selection to determine an action associated with the second alias selection and then executes the action. Importantly, the action associated with the *first* alias selection is *the same as* the action associated with the *second* alias selection, even though the aliases themselves are *different*. Thus, claim 1 provides for customized network shells having customized aliases stored in association with actions on behalf of diverse users. See *Applicant's Specification* at pages 20-23.

Applicant maintains that Hayes does not disclose two users utilizing different aliases for the same action or program. In contrast, Hayes (U.S. Patent No. 6, 205, 476) merely discloses applications or applets that are customized on a user or user group basis. While desktop preferences or application preferences can be altered on a per user basis, Hayes does not disclose two users utilizing different aliases for the same action or program. For instance, two users may arrange their desktops differently, but the icons representing programs or macros on the two desktops are the same across the arrangement of both users. See *Hayes*, col. 2.

Independent claims 15 and 43 contain limitations similar to claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons. The dependent claims, while separately allowable over the art of record, depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims for the sake of brevity.

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance. Any fees in addition to those submitted may be charged to deposit account 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12-27-04

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176

Setter Ollila LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball

6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100

Overland Park, KS 66251-2100